

The Honorable Robert S. Lasnik

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE**

SUSAN SOTO PALMER, et. al.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

STEVEN HOBBS, et. al.,

Defendants,

and

JOSE TREVINO, ISMAEL CAMPOS, and
ALEX YBARRA,

Intervenor-Defendants.

Case No.: 3:22-cv-05035-RSL

Judge: Robert S. Lasnik

**PARTIES' JOINT SUBMISSION
OF PROPOSED SPECIAL
MASTER CANDIDATES**

BACKGROUND

On October 4, 2023, this Court issued an order directing the Parties to “confer regarding nominees to act as Special Master to assist the Court” in assessing and modifying as necessary the remedial district maps to be submitted by the parties. Dkt. # 230 at 2. “In the event the parties are unable to reach agreement” on a remedy map, among other things, the court further ordered that the parties “jointly identify three candidates for the Special Master position” and that the parties provide their respective positions on each candidate. *Id.* at 2-3. Pursuant to that Order, the Parties held a meet-and-confer on November 16, 2023, and were unable to reach an agreement on a remedy map, and now, pursuant to the Order of the Court jointly submit this filing with their respective nominees and positions.

1 Plaintiffs, the State of Washington, and Intervenor-Defendants have each identified one
 2 candidate and have provided their positions on the other two candidates. Secretary of State Hobbs
 3 takes no position on the candidates.

4 NOMINATIONS

5 A. Plaintiffs' Nomination: Mr. David Ely, Compass Demographics

6 Mr. David Ely is the President and Founder of Compass Demographics, a consulting and
 7 database management firm that specializes in election data, redistricting, demographic analysis,
 8 and voter behavior. Ex. A (Ely CV). In 2023, Mr. Ely served as the cartographer on the special
 9 master team in the Northern District of Alabama in *Milligan v. Allen*, and in 2019 was selected to
 10 serve as a special master in the Middle District of Louisiana in *Terrebonne Parish NAACP et al*
 11 *vs. Governor of Louisiana. Id.* at 4. In *Allen*, the court noted that no party objected to Mr. Ely's
 12 appointment. *Singleton v. Allen*, No. 2:21-CV-1291-AMM, 2023 WL 6567895, at *5, *7-*9 (N.D.
 13 Ala. Oct. 5, 2023). The court ultimately adopted the map that Mr. Ely had drawn and analyzed. *Id.*
 14 at *17.

15 Mr. Ely has also served as an expert and testified on behalf of both plaintiffs and defendant
 16 jurisdictions in voting-rights litigation, as well as for the United States. He has more than three
 17 decades of experience researching and consulting on redistricting and elections matters, including
 18 serving as a consultant or expert witness in over 40 voting rights and redistricting cases. Ex. A at
 19 4-5. Mr. Ely has also assisted more than 40 state and local jurisdictions as a consultant during their
 20 redistricting processes on matters ranging from database construction and demographic and voter
 21 analysis to the development of districting plans and analysis of alternative redistricting plans. *Id.*
 22 at 1-3. He has extensive experience managing redistricting projects, analyzing voting behavior,
 23 and working with demographic data.
 24
 25
 26

1 Mr. Ely's CV is attached as Exhibit A, and an affidavit stating his interest and availability
2 is attached as Exhibit B.

3
4 **State of Washington's position on Mr. Ely:**

5 The State believes that David Ely is an excellent candidate to serve as a special master. As
6 the three-judge court noted in appointing Mr. Ely as a cartographer in *Milligan v. Allen*, "Mr. Ely
7 has extensive experience as a map-drawer, consultant, and expert on districting plans. He has
8 drawn maps and provided expert consulting services for cities, counties, and other legislative
9 bodies in Texas, California, Utah, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Massachusetts, and Illinois. He has also
10 previously recommended remedial plans to a federal district court to remedy a Voting Rights Act
11 in his capacity as a special master in a redistricting case in Louisiana. Based on the current
12 information before the Court, the Court finds David R. Ely well qualified to serve as the Court's
13 cartographer in this case." ECF No. 204, *Milligan v. Allen*, Case No. 2:21-cv-1530-AMM (N.D.
14 Ala., Aug. 2, 2023); *see also* ECF No. 385, *Terrebonne Parish Branch NAACP vs. Piyush*
15 *"Bobby" Jindal*, Case No. 3:14-cv-00069-SDD-EWD (M.D. La., Mar. 15, 2019) ("[T]he Court
16 finds that David R. Ely is best qualified to serve as Special Master in this case. Mr. Ely has
17 extensive experience addressing issues like those presented herein, and there is no suggestion that
18 Mr. Ely would investigate the appropriate remedy in this matter in a partisan manner.").

19 Mr. Ely's fairly extensive history in serving as a plaintiff-side expert could support an
20 inference of bias, but in light of his prior courts appointments as a neutral expert, the State does
21 not have concerns with Mr. Ely's possible appointment.

22 **Intervenor-Defendants' position on Mr. Ely:**

23 Intervenor-Defendants recommend against the appointment of Mr. David Ely. Mr. Ely's
24 opinions in voting rights cases have repeatedly been criticized by courts. *See, e.g., Benavidez v.*
25 *Irving Indep. Sch. Dist.*, 2014 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 113239, *20 (court rejects a portion of Mr. Ely's
26 opinions because Ely relied on data that he rejected in arriving at another one of his expert

1 opinions); *Kumar v. Frisco Indep. Sch. Dist.*, 476 F. Supp. 3d 439, 472-481 (court finds portion of
2 Ely's methods produced "unreliable" results. The data Ely relied on was "error-prone". As such,
3 the court declined to consider opinions that relied on this unreliable data). Mr. Ely lacks advanced
4 degrees and research experience that lend credibility to his analysis. Finally, Mr. Ely almost
5 exclusively serves as an expert for plaintiffs and appears to have primarily provided expert
6 opinions that uniquely favor plaintiffs in litigation.

7 Given the presence of other, qualified candidates ready and willing to serve as special
8 master, Intervenor-Defendants recommend against Mr. Ely's selection.

9
10 **B. State of Washington's Nomination: Karin Mac Donald, Q2 Data & Research, LLC**

11 The State recommends the Court appoint Karin Mac Donald as special master in this
12 matter. As detailed in her CV, Ms. Mac Donald has extensive experience serving as a consultant
13 to government entities and independent commissions in complicated redistricting matters,
14 including as the principal consultant to the California Citizens Redistricting Commission in 2021
15 and 2011 to construct assembly, senate, and congressional districts for California. She is the
16 current Director of the Statewide Database, which is the redistricting database for the State of
17 California that also provides non-partisan support and assistance to the general public, news media,
18 scholars, and legislators. She is also the Senior Researcher and Owner of Q2 Data & Research
19 LLC, a consulting firm which provides qualitative and quantitative research and technical services
20 for redistricting, elections, and election administration. Moreover, Ms. Mac Donald considers
21 herself strictly non-partisan; she is the only one of the three candidates who does not regularly
22 serve as a paid party expert witness in redistricting litigation. The State believes Ms. Mac Donald's
23 technical expertise, non-partisan stance, and commitment to public service, transparency, and
24 working with diverse stakeholders will be helpful to the Court in considering and entering a
25 remedial legislative district map.
26

Ms. Mac Donald's CV is attached as Exhibit C and her statement of interest is attached as Exhibit D.

Plaintiffs' position on Ms. Mac Donald:

Plaintiffs have no objection to the nomination of Ms. Mac Donald.

Intervenor-Defendants' position on Ms. Mac Donald:

Intervenor-Defendants recommend against the appointment of Ms. Mac Donald as special master. With the majority of her redistricting experience coming as an academic, she lacks the practical experience that would be most helpful in advising the Court in this matter. Experience serving as an expert in litigation and as a solely independent consultant are experiences that Ms. Mac Donald lacks that would be a hinderance to her providing relevant and practical advice. State legislative maps, such as the map at issue here, must take into account the practical realities of circumstances that are not best understood in the ivory towers of academia alone, but coupled with the realities of life that are only learned outside academia. This lack of practical, real-life experience is evidenced when in 2018 Ms. Mac Donald was retained by both sides in litigation (both the governmental entity and the local activists protesting the actions of that governmental entity) pertaining to a city map involving Santa Monica, California. Jorge Casuso, "Top Voting Demographics Expert Advised City, Activists on Santa Monica Redistricting," SANTA MONICA LOOKOUT (Aug. 28, 2018), available at https://www.surfsantamonica.com/ssm_site/the_lookout/news/News-2018/August-2018/08_28_2018_Top_Voting_Demographics_%20Expert_Advised_City_Activists_on_Santa_Monica_Redistricting.html (Discussing Ms. Mac Donald providing advice to conflicting parties in litigation).

1 Additionally, it does not appear that Ms. Mac Donald has practical experience applying
 2 “traditional districting principles such as maintaining communities of interest and traditional
 3 boundaries,” *Bush v. Vera*, 517 U.S. 952, 977 (1996), or other important factors like “preserving
 4 the cores of prior districts and avoiding contests between incumbent Representatives,” *Karcher v.*
 5 *Daggett*, 462 U.S. 725, 740 (1983), which are important considerations to help ensure the
 6 democratic legitimacy of a state legislative district map drawn by a federal court.
 7

8 While the lack of regular involvement with litigation might give the appearance of neutrality,
 9 in this case, the Court needs a special master who has experience providing advice within the
 10 constructs of litigation. For these reasons, Ms. Mac Donald is not the Court’s best option to serve
 11 as special master.
 12

13 **C. Intervenor-Defendants’ Nomination: Dr. Douglas Johnson, National Demographics** 14 **Corporation**

15 Intervenor-Defendants recommend the Court appoint Dr. Douglas Johnson as special
 16 master in this matter. As detailed in his CV, Dr. Johnson has extensive experience serving as a
 17 primary map drawer or consultant for hundreds of independent commissions and local
 18 jurisdictions—the vast majority of these maps were adopted within the footprint of the Ninth
 19 Circuit. Dr. Johnson has also served as an expert in multiple courts across the country where he
 20 has been qualified as an expert. *See, e.g., Navajo Nation v. Arizona Indep. Redistricting Comm’n*,
 21 230 F. Supp. 2d 998, 1011 (“The Court finds Mr. Johnson qualified to provide the opinions given
 22 and finds them reliable.”). Dr. Johnson is the President of National Demographics Corporation
 23 where he, along with his qualified team of consultants, use their over 40 years of experience to
 24 provide advice to local governments, states, and organizations primarily across California and
 25
 26

1 Arizona. Dr. Johnson has served credibly as an expert in many state court cases, that were all but
 2 ignored by the other parties. Additionally, most of the cherry-picked cases discussing Dr. Johnson
 3 are either currently on appeal or have been reversed on appeal. With Dr. Johnson you get a special
 4 master who as worked with non-partisan independent commissions across the Ninth Circuit
 5 footprint, you also get someone who has substantial educational training and teaching experience,
 6 as well as a professional who knows how to navigate a legal proceeding—no other special possess
 7 all three of these qualities.
 8

9 Dr. Johnson’s CV is attached as Exhibit E and a statement of interest is attached as Exhibit
 10 F.

11 **Plaintiffs’ position on Dr. Johnson:**

12 Plaintiffs object to the appointment of Dr. Johnson as a special master in this case. In every
 13 case Dr. Johnson lists on his CV where he testified as an expert witness, the court rejected his
 14 testimony. *See Covington v. North Carolina*, 283 F. Supp. 3d 410, 450 (M.D.N.C. 2018) (Johnson
 15 analysis and opinion “unreliable and not persuasive”); *Luna v. Cnty. of Kern*, 291 F. Supp. 3d
 16 1088, 1137 (E.D. Cal. 2018) (Johnson’s testimony “insufficient” and argument based on it “lacks
 17 merits”); *Garrett v City of Highland*, 2016 WL 3693498, at *2 (Cal. Super. Apr. 06, 2016)
 18 (Johnson methodology “inappropriate”); *Jauregui v City of Palmdale*, No. BC483039, 2013 WL
 19 7018375, at *2 (Cal. Super. Dec. 23, 2013) (Johnson’s work “unsuitable” and “troubling”). In a
 20 more recent case in which Dr. Johnson testified that does not appear on his CV, the court found
 21 Dr. Johnson’s mapping analysis “unpersuasive” and “join[ed] other courts in rejecting Dr.
 22 Johnson’s methodologies, analyses, and conclusions.” *Common Cause v. Lewis*, No. 18 CVS
 23 014001, 2019 WL 4569584, at *95 (N.C. Super. Sep. 3, 2019) *abrogated on other grounds by*
 24
 25
 26

1 *Harper v. Hall*, 886 S.E.2d 393, 447 (N.C. 2023). Dr. Johnson’s explanations “appear[ed] to be
 2 purely speculative,” “d[id] not withstand minimal scrutiny,” and were “not credible,” and his map
 3 “suffered from a critical error.” *Id.* at *44. The *Common Cause* court also struck large portions of
 4 Dr. Johnson’s testimony and report under Rule 702 and Rule 403 “after it was uncovered on cross-
 5 examination that Dr. Johnson had made a series of significant errors.” *Id.* at *96. Another court
 6 recently rejected a remedial plan Dr. Johnson drew for the City of Jacksonville, because it “fail[ed]
 7 to meaningfully remedy the violation” of voters’ rights. *Jacksonville Branch of the NAACP v. City*
 8 *of Jacksonville*, No. 3:22-cv-493-MMH-LLL (M.D. Fla. Dec. 19, 2022) (order) at 56.

10 Dr. Johnson has been repeatedly accused of drawing maps specifically to advantage white
 11 incumbents at the expense of Latino voters. *See* Monica Valez, *Selma Is Moving to District*
 12 *Elections. Some Say the Proposed Districts Don’t Represent the Community*, KVPR (Sep. 6,
 13 2019), [https://www.courthousenews.com/judges-scrap-republicans-expert-in-nc-gerrymandering-](https://www.courthousenews.com/judges-scrap-republicans-expert-in-nc-gerrymandering-trial/)
 14 [trial/](https://www.courthousenews.com/judges-scrap-republicans-expert-in-nc-gerrymandering-trial/); David Daley, *Will Arizona’s relentless Republican gerrymander decide the 2024*
 15 *presidential election?*, Salon (Dec. 4, 2021), [www.salon.com/2021/12/04/will-arizonas-relentless-](http://www.salon.com/2021/12/04/will-arizonas-relentless-gerrymander-decide-the-2024-presidential-election/)
 16 [gerrymander-decide-the-2024-presidential-election/](http://www.salon.com/2021/12/04/will-arizonas-relentless-gerrymander-decide-the-2024-presidential-election/). In addition, Dr. Johnson and his firm are
 17 considered biased and controversial. *See id.*; *see also* Kasey Bubnash, *Redistricting commission*
 18 *votes to keep controversial demographer*, Santa Maria Sun (Jan. 27, 2021),
 19 [https://www.santamariasun.com/news/redistricting-commission-votes-to-keep-controversial-](https://www.santamariasun.com/news/redistricting-commission-votes-to-keep-controversial-demographer-14799563)
 20 [demographer-14799563](https://www.santamariasun.com/news/redistricting-commission-votes-to-keep-controversial-demographer-14799563). Because of the lack of credibility courts have afforded Dr. Johnson, his
 21 history of drawing or supporting maps that specifically disadvantage Latino voters, and his biases
 22 evident in his work, it would be inappropriate for Dr. Johnson to serve as Special Master in this
 23 case, and Plaintiffs oppose his nomination for that role.
 24
 25
 26

State of Washington’s position on Dr. Johnson:

The State recommends against the appointment of Dr. Douglas Johnson. Dr. Johnson’s opinions in voting rights cases have repeatedly been rejected by courts. As one court recently summarized:

Dr. Johnson has testified as a live expert witness in four cases previously, and the courts in all four cases have rejected his analysis. [*S*]ee *Covington v. North Carolina*, 283 F. Supp. 3d 410, 450 (M.D.N.C. 2018), *aff’d in relevant part*, 138 S. Ct. 2548 (2018)] (finding “Dr. Johnson’s analysis and opinion . . . unreliable and not persuasive”); *Luna v. Cnty. of Kern*, 291 F. Supp. 3d 1088, 1137 (E.D. Cal. 2018) (holding that defendants’ argument based on Dr. Johnson’s analysis “lacks merits”); *Garrett v City of Highland*, 2016 WL 3693498, at *2 (Cal. Super. Apr. 06, 2016) (finding Dr. Johnson’s methodology “inappropriate”); *Jauregui v City of Palmdale*, No. BC483039, 2013 WL 7018375, at *2 (Cal. Super. Dec. 23, 2013) (describing Dr. Johnson’s work in the case as “unsuitable” and “troubling”). This Court joins these other courts in rejecting Dr. Johnson’s methodologies, analyses, and conclusions.

Common Cause v. Lewis, No. 18 CVS 014001, 2019 WL 4569584, at *95 (N.C. Super. Ct. Sep. 3, 2019), *abrogated on other grounds by Harper v. Hall*, 384 N.C. 292, 376, 886 S.E.2d 393, 447 (2023) (record citation omitted); *see also Nairne v. Ardoin*, CV 22-178-SDD-SDJ, 2023 WL 7388850, at *3–4 (M.D. La. Nov. 8, 2023) (largely excluding Dr. Johnson’s proposed testimony on racial predominance as beyond his expertise, “irrelevant,” “unhelpful,” “a waste of judicial and party resources,” “[c]onclusory,” and “pejorative”); Tentative Ruling, *Sanchez v. City of Martinez*, Case No. MSC18-02219 (Contra Costa (CA) Cnty. Super. Ct. May 3, 2019) (concluding that a map drawn by Dr. Johnson “verges on self-parody in flouting [the compactness] criterion,” “was consciously drawn to try to *cross* boundaries of community of interests,” and “went out of its way to ensure that the districts cut across one of the main existing geographical dividers . . . , rather than using it as a convenient boundary”) (emphasis in original); David Daley, “Ohio Speaker Cupp gets nationally controversial, GOP-aligned mapmaker into redraw process,” OHIO CAPITAL JOURNAL (Mar. 23, 2022), available at <https://ohiocapitaljournal.com/2022/03/23/ohio-speaker-cupp-gets-nationally-controversial-gop-aligned-mapmaker-into-redraw-process/> (“Johnson is

among the nation’s most controversial and GOP-aligned mapmakers.”) (hyperlinked citations omitted).

Given the presence of other, qualified candidates ready and willing to serve as special master, the State recommends against Dr. Johnson’s selection.

Dated: December 1, 2023

Respectfully submitted,

By: /s/Annabelle Harless

Edwardo Morfin
WSBA No. 47831
MORFIN LAW FIRM, PLLC
2602 N. Proctor Street, Suite 205
Tacoma, WA 98407
Telephone: 509-380-9999

Chad W. Dunn*
Sonni Waknin*
UCLA VOTING RIGHTS PROJECT
3250 Public Affairs Building
Los Angeles, CA 90095
Telephone: 310-400-6019
Chad@uclavrp.org
Sonni@uclavrp.org

Mark P. Gaber*
Simone Leeper*
Aseem Mulji*
Benjamin Phillips*
CAMPAIGN LEGAL CENTER
1101 14th St. NW, Ste. 400
Washington, DC 20005
mgaber@campaignlegal.org
sleeper@campaignlegal.org
amulji@campaignlegal.org
bphillips@campaignlegal.org

Thomas A. Saenz*
Ernest Herrera*
Leticia M. Saucedo*
Erika Cervantes*
MEXICAN AMERICAN LEGAL DEFENSE
AND EDUCATIONAL FUND
643 S. Spring St., 11th Fl.
Los Angeles, CA 90014
Telephone: (213) 629-2512
tsaenz@maldef.org
eherrera@maldef.org
lsaucedo@maldef.org
ecervantes@maldef.org

Annabelle E. Harless*
CAMPAIGN LEGAL CENTER
55 W. Monroe St., Ste. 1925
Chicago, IL 60603
aharless@campaignlegal.org

*Admitted pro hac vice
Counsel for Plaintiffs

1 ROBERT W. FERGUSON
2 Attorney General

3 /s/ Andrew R.W. Hughes

4 ANDREW R.W. HUGHES, WSBA #49515
5 ERICA R. FRANKLIN, WSBA #43477
6 Assistant Attorneys General
7 800 Fifth Avenue, Suite 2000
8 Seattle, WA 98104
(206) 464-7744
andrew.hughes@atg.wa.gov
erica.franklin@atg.wa.gov

9 CRISTINA SEPE, WSBA #53609
10 Deputy Solicitor General
11 1125 Washington Street SE
12 PO Box 40100
13 Olympia, WA 98504-0100
14 (360) 753-6200
cristina.sepe@atg.wa.gov

Attorneys for Defendant State of Washington

15 ROBERT W. FERGUSON
16 Attorney General

17 *s/ Karl D. Smith*

18 KARL D. SMITH, WSBA 41988
19 Deputy Solicitor General
20 KATE S. WORTHINGTON, WSBA 47556
21 Assistant Attorney General
22 1125 Washington Street SE
23 PO Box 40100
24 Olympia, WA 98504-0100
25 (360) 753-6200
26 Karl.Smith@atg.wa.gov
Kate.Worthington@atg.wa.gov

Attorneys for Defendant Steven Hobbs

s/Andrew R. Stokesbary

Andrew R. Stokesbary, WSBA No. 46097
CHALMERS, ADAMS, BACKER &
KAUFMAN, LLC
701 Fifth Avenue, Suite 4200
Seattle, WA 98104
T: (206) 813-9322
dstokesbary@chalmersadams.com

Jason B. Torchinsky (*admitted pro hac vice*)
Phillip M. Gordon (*admitted pro hac vice*)
Dallin B. Holt (*admitted pro hac vice*)
Brennan A.R. Bowen (*admitted pro hac vice*)
Caleb Acker (*admitted pro hac vice*)
HOLTZMAN VOGEL BARAN
TORCHINSKY & JOSEFIK, PLC
15405 John Marshall Hwy
Haymarket, VA 20169
T: (540) 341-8808
jtorchinsky@holtzmanvogel.com
pgordon@holtzmanvogel.com
dholt@holtzmanvogel.com
bbowen@HoltzmanVogel.com
cacker@HoltzmanVogel.com

Counsel for Intervenor-Defendants

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that all counsel of record were served a copy of the foregoing this 1st day of
December 2023, via the Court's CM/ECF system.

s/Annabelle Harless
Annabelle Harless
Counsel for Plaintiffs